DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 398 768 FL 024 084

AUTHOR Yemenici, Alev
TITLE A Discourse-Centered Approach: Repetition in Cross-Cultural Settings.
PUB DATE 27 Mar 96
NOTE 44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (30th, Chicago, IL, March 26-30, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Audience Awareness; Audience Response; College Faculty; College Graduates; College Students; Contrastive Linguistics; *Cultural Differences; Cultural Traits; Discourse Analysis; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; High School Graduates; *Intercultural Communication; *Language Patterns; North American English; Personal Narratives; Pragmatics; *Redundancy; *Story Telling; Syntax; Turkish; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS *English (British); *Repetition (Language)

ABSTRACT

A study investigated how repetition was used in the telling of personal narratives to create emotional involvement on the part of listeners, to evaluate stories, to prevent listeners from asking questions and from losing the story's focus, and to justify narrating that particular story in a cross-cultural setting. It was assumed that narrators from different cultures (American English, British English, Turkish) would use repetition for different narrative purposes. Subjects were 15 each Turkish, British, and American high school graduates, college students and graduates, and college faculty. Each narrated a personal experience about a danger of death situation or an event creating nervousness, using his native language, which was analyzed for repetition types (lexical, syntactic, discursal), subcategories, functions (emphatic, thematic, persuasive, artistic), and frequency. It is concluded that narrators from different cultures use different discourse strategies to evaluate their narratives and involve listeners. However, since cultural expectations direct communication, the potential for miscommunication exists in cross-cultural exchanges. Contains 20 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 398 768

EVENT # 3075
A DISCOURSE-CENTERED APPROACH: REPETITION IN CROSS-CULTURAL SETTINGS

ALEV YEMENİCİ, Phd.

ANKARA UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF LETTERS

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
(e-mail: ay02-k@servis2.net.tr)

30th ANNUAL TESOL CONVENTION

March 27, 1996
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, USA

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Alev Yemenici

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL024084

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Language is a complex element which influences and shapes culture and is influenced and shaped by culture in return. Across cultures there are variations in patterns of communication. When two people from different cultures exchange information, they make predictions about the message conveyed depending on their background knowledge about the topic and on their cultural presuppositions. For instance, speakers' use of their native language is based on cultural presuppositions that determine the kinds of language behavior that are sociolinguistically appropriate for particular situations. When the cultural expectations that are reflected in the discourse mechanism of the language are different, there occurs a cultural gap between the interlocutors.

Language not only means vocabulary, syntax and phonology but it includes discoursal mechanisms for interpersonal and cross-cultural communication as well. These mechanisms reveal social rules and cultural habits. The rules or value systems of societies powerfully influence the rules of discourse in communication. Therefore, they help determine whether and to what extent there may be a cultural barrier between the speaker and the foreign language s/he speaks. Consequently, study of discourse structures leads to an awareness of the origins of some of the principal cultural presuppositions conveyed in discourse and to minimization of the cultural barriers that cause uneasiness and lack of control on the part of the interlocutors.

This research investigated how repetition was used to create emotional involvement on the part of the listeners, to evaluate stories, to prevent listeners from asking questions such as "so what," losing the focus of the stories and to justify narrating that particular story in oral personal narratives in a cross-cultural setting. It was assumed that narrators from different cultures would use repetition as a strategy to create involvement, to create emotional impact as a universal trait while they would prefer to use different types and categories of repetition for different purposes ("purposes" being functions repetitions create to evoke involvement, to contribute to the

general emotional impact), which was hypothesized as culture-specific. The assumption behind this research was that narrators from different cultures would employ different types of repetition for different purposes. The British and the American narrators were assumed to use more syntactic repetition while the Turkish narrators were presumed to use more discoursal repetition to create emotional involvement, emotional involvement being the overall function of repetition that remains constant across cultures. Within this overarching function of involvement, this study investigated whether the relationships among lexical, syntactic or discoursal repetition and among the artistic, thematic, emphatic and persuasive functions varied by culture. In other words, this study investigated the functions of different types and categories of repetition in oral personal experience narratives across American, British and Turkish cultures.

I will begin with a brief overview of the studies done in the cross-cultural communication field. Then the theoretical framework for the study will be presented. The results include comparisons of the types, categories and functions of repetition between cultures.

BACKGROUND

Smith (1987) believes that problems in cross-cultural communication in English, which involve discourse strategies, occur when a speaker uses the discourse strategies of his mother tongue during cross-cultural communication, when speakers of native languages believe that "there is only one correct set of strategies for discourse in English" and when "everyone using English attempts to use that set" (p. 5).

Because societies differ in their societal norms, researchers who work on cross-cultural communication focus on various dimensions across cultures such as individualism/collectivism, low-context and high-context communication, uncertainty avoidance in communication and masculinity/femininity dimensions, to

name only a few. In this research results that are compared and contrasted on a cross-cultural scale will be examined by Hall's and Hofstede's Dimensions of Cultural Variability and Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey's face negotiation theory (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988). The dimensions that form the criteria by which the results are evaluated are individualism/collectivism, high- and low-context communication, uncertainty avoidance and direct/indirect modes of communication.

Individualism/Collectivism: In Hall's and Hofstede's scale, countries such as USA and Great Britain are highly individualistic cultures while Turkey, Arab cultures and Greece are collectivistic (see Appendix A). In an individualistic culture, individuals' goals and self-realization are of the utmost importance. Individualistic people are responsible for themselves and their immediate families. The "I" identity is valued in these cultures. In addition, individualistic cultures place emphasis on the individual's achievement and initiative. Individuals are free to strive for their private interests (Parsons, 1951).

In the collectivistic cultures, group goals and cooperation are of the highest importance. In these cultures, people are not isolated individuals. They share responsibilty in their social groups. According to Triandis (1986) group benefits, goals and needs are more important than the individual's for collectivistic people and "the social norms of the ingroup, rather than individual pleasure; shared ingroup beliefs, rather than individual beliefs; and a value on cooperation with ingroup members, rather than maximizing individual outcomes" (Gudykunst, and Ting-Toomey, 1988, p. 41) are emphasized. These two cultural dimensions underline substantial differences between cultures.

Low-context and High-context Communication: Hall (1976) differentiates between two types of communication among the members of different cultures. During a high-context communication "most of the information is either in the physical context or internalized in the person, while very little is in the coded,

explicit, transmitted part of the message" (p. 79). However, during a low-context communication, "the mass of the information is vested in the explicit code" (p. 79). Countries such as USA, Great Britain and Sweden belong to the low-context end of the continuum while Turkey, Arab cultures and Iran belong to the high-context end (see Appendix A).

Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988) state that all cultures that are labelled as high-context are collectivistic and all cultures that are labelled as low-context in Hall's system are individualistic according to Hofstede's schema. Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey further argue that there is a relationship among high- and low-context communication and directness/indirectness and certainty/uncertainty in communication. For instance, according to Levine (1985) communication in the USA, which is an individualistic culture where low-context communication prevails, is clear and direct.

Uncertainty Avoidance: The United States and Great Britain are low on the Uncertainty Avoidance Scale while Turkey and Arab cultures are high (see Appendix A). Hofstede (1979) defines cultures that are high in uncertainty avoidance as having a lower tolerance "for uncertainty and ambiguity, which expresses itself in higher levels of anxiety and energy release, greater need for formal rules and absolute truth, and less tolerance for people or groups with deviant ideas or behavior" (p. 395). According to Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988), people who belong to high-context, high uncertainty avoidance cultures have "a strong tendency for consensus and have higher levels of intolerance for ambiguity" (p. 47). In addition, in these cultures people tend to avoid confrontations and disagreements in public because this is considered to be "a severe blow and an extreme insult causing both sides to 'lose face'" (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988, p. 154). This cultural inclination may result in preference for indirect modes of communication, which will be discussed later. Individuals in low-context, low uncertainty avoidance cultures "can fight and scream at one another over a task-

oriented point and yet are able to remain friends afterwards" (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988, p. 154) because in these cultures people "have lower stress levels and weaker superegos and accept dissent and taking risks more than high uncertainty avoidance cultures" (p. 47). This cultural trait may lead to the use of direct communication mode which may be recognized as one of the low-context conflict management strategies.

Direct/Indirect Modes of Communication and Facework: According to Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988), face negotiation is a very important component of oral communication in all cultures. When there is a conflict situation where a person is humiliated or embarrassed, the face-saving or face-protecting issues come to the forefront. In other words, "when the situated identities of the interactants are called into question, all negotiators express a concern for self-face protection or other-face support (or both) in problematic situations" (p. 89). Ting-Toomey's face negotiation theory states that members of individualistic cultures prefer to use "defend-attack strategies that aim at protecting self autonomy while attacking and assaulting the privacy and the self-integrity of the other conflict party " (p.92) during the communication process while members of high-context and collectivistic cultures prefer to use "camouflage-smoothing strategies that aim at protecting face from others' criticisms and rejections and at the same time smooth over the apparent conflicting interests" (p. 92). In other words, while members of low-context cultures prefer "overt face negotiation tactics," members of high-context cultures tend to use "ambiguous face tactics" (p. 92). These propositions developed by Ting-Toomey may lead to the assumption that preference of direct or indirect mode of communication is closely related to the above-mentioned face-protection supra-strategies.

In other words, members of high-context, collectivistic cultures may be expected to use indirect mode of communication to avoid conflict situations where they may lose face. Since their "apprehension level of unpredictable situations"

is very high, they would use "understatements and silence to manage the situation" (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988, p. 108). Since their major aim is to protect group harmony avoiding offending the other conflict party, they can preserve their face by this indirect style. On the other hand, members of low-context, individualistic cultures may be expected to use direct mode through which they reveal their "true intentions in terms of their wants, needs and desires in the discourse process" (p. 100). Since their apprehension level is low, they would be exact and "up-front in their verbal communication style" (p. 108). They would not use elaborate verbal styles or understatements. This difference that exists in the communication styles of different cultures may lead to miscommunication or communication gaps across cultures especially when the narrators try to attract the listeners' attention to the point of their stories, by using various strategies to involve them in their stories emotionally.

In the light of the above-mentioned studies, this research investigated whether there was a relationship between the results of the analysis of the repetition types, categories and functions in oral narratives and the individualism/collectivism, high- and low-context communication, uncertainty avoidance dimensions as presented in Hofstede's cultural dimension scale and direct and indirect modes of communication.

METHOD

Subjects

15 each Turkish, British and American highschool graduates, university students, university graduates and university professors, participated in this study. The age of the subjects ranged between 18 and 55. Out of the 15 Turkish subjects, 6 were males and 9 were females. Out of the 15 American subjects, 5 were males and 10 were females. Out of the 15 British subjects, 5 were males and 10 were females. In the course of the study, the gender and age factors were not taken into account.

Data

The subjects were asked to narrate a personal experience. The narrators narrated their personal stories as a response to the question "Have you ever had a danger of death experience? If not tell me about a situation or an event when you felt very nervous" (the British and the American narrators narrated their stories in English while the Turkish narrators narrated their stories in Turkish). Since this type of narrative inducement is a replication of Labov's narrative collection procedure, the subjects used a narrative type in which they recapitulated their past experiences. This research used Labov's model as a point of departure and focused on repetition as an evaluation strategy to create emotional involvement and focused on how narrators from different cultures evoked involvement through repetition.

Overview of Analytical Procedures

While conducting the research, oral data were collected through tape-recording and then analyzed. First, the repetition types, categories and functions of repetitions were identified and defined. Repetitions were counted according to the repetition types and categories they belonged to. Then functions each repetition type served were defined and according to the framework of analysis, functions were counted, and then percentages were calculated from the numeral results of the analysis. This procedure was repeated for all the three cultures. To compare the results in percentages for different culture groups, z values were estimated. To compare two proportions, to estimate the differences between two binomial parameters (Mendenhall, Reinmuth and Beaver, 1989), **z distribution** was used. And finally, after the information was organized into findings, the findings were compared and contrasted to show the differences among the 3 different cultures.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FRAMEWORK OF ANALYSIS

The framework used for the analysis of the types, categories and functions of repetition in the present study draws on elements of Labov (1972), Johnstone Koch (1986), Tannen (1985) and Persson (1974). In this study repetition is grouped under three major headings: lexical repetition, syntactic repetition, and discoursal repetition.

Lexical Repetition

This type of repetition covers repetition of one word only.

1. Lexical repetition of addition

a. lexical item - intensifier/modifier - same lexical item

Example 1: We just happened to park behind right behind one.

b. Expansion with "like"

Example 2: I saw a rock like granite.

2. Lexical repetition of substitution

a. word substitute

Example 3: He only felt it when he started feeling something wet, but the guy immediately after that he just ran away.

b. lexical repetition of a syntactic unit

Example 4: Well, this is it, this is "I'm gonna die" and I don't remember feeling anything except quite calm about it.

3. Reduplication

Compound words that are composed of two elements which are either identical or slightly different fall into this category: **tiny little.**

However, reduplication of quantifiers that are intended to intensify the adjectives or adjectives that modify nouns that follow also belong to this category in this study: **big big bloke.**

4. Exact (lexical) repetition

Example 5: He wanted to bring the punks in, he preferred the punks.

Syntactic Repetition

This type of repetition covers repetition of two or more words or word combinations. Prepositional phrases fall into the syntactic repetition category. However, if the word occurs in the same narrative without the preposition, it is taken as lexical repetition: **wait for/wait.**

1. **Exact repetition of a syntactic unit**

Example 6: Get your keys, get your keys, get your keys.

2. **Syntactic repetition of substitution**

Example 7: They went into the room and he the coffin was in the middle.

3. **Syntactic repetition of addition (with modifier or intensifier)**

Example 8: We went to Kas, we went to Kas for the first time.

4. **Syntactic repetition of a unit with a lexical item missing**

Example 9: There was a very high rock you know a high rock.

5. **Syntactic parallelism**

Example 10: ... and I had told her that I'd stay home and we'd wait for this important phone call together.

Discoursal Repetition

This type of repetition covers repetition of synonymous words and repetition of utterances that have almost the same meaning with different structures.

1. **Single word paraphrase**

a. **Synonymy** (Synonymous or partially synonymous words)

Example 11: I found a fender that was like new, a rear fender.

b. **Metonymy**

Example 12: .. my arm I could feel air in my hand.

c. **Pairs of words connected with "and/or" which are nearly or completely synonymous** (with the exception of cliches: e.g. **time and again**)

Example 13: So just intuitively or instinctively or whatever I got over into the next lane.

2. Paraphrase

a. Rewording

Example 14: I couldn't reach the surface of the water. I couldn't get there.

b. Reverse paraphrase

Example 15: I don't remember feeling anything except quite calm about it.... I just remember being very shocked.

3. Syntactic repetition with expansion

a. Expansion with "like/I mean..."

Example 16: I said, "Oh my God" I said like "Oh my God, thank you".

b. Expansion with addition

Example 17: I kind of froze. I froze mainly fear like I don't know what to do.

c. Immediate explanation

Example 18: I didn't realize that it was a solid line and a solid line means you have to stay on one side of the road.

4. Expansion with different structures

Example 19: I don't remember which year it was but it was during my childhood just before I reached adolescence.

5. Explanation with different structures

Example 20: She applied for internships, to be an intern as a clinical psychologist next year in medical schools.

The framework of analysis used in this study distinguishes between repetition types[1]. However, at this point it should be stated that overlaps occured between the repetition types[2].

FUNCTIONS OF REPETITION

The major functions that were created by the 3 types of repetition in the narratives are: emphatic, thematic, persuasive and artistic.

Emphatic Repetition

Different forms of repetition help emphasize the consequential events and ideas. There are 3 types of repetition that function as a device to emphasize an utterance:

Repetition as a clarification device: The speakers may use repetitive words or word combinations to clarify/explain/support the previous utterance. If this additional information is not new then the speakers are assumed to use their repetition for clarification purposes.

Repetition as an expanding device: Repeating the previous utterance with elaboration helps put emphasis on the important aspects of the action/event. Expanded repetition may be "characterized by the addition of an amplifying or modifying element" (Persson, p. 10). In addition, the speaker who uses repetition for expansion purposes aims to provide new information or specific information.

---

[1]Repetition types that were excluded in the course of this study are repair repetitions, repetitions as time savers, morphological and phonological repetitions, syntactically required pronoun repetitions as in "I think I...", elliptic repetition when the speaker decides not to repeat a syntactic unit because s/he wants to speak fast or to concentrate on a different aspect of the issue at hand or to change focus, or because s/he might not repeat an utterance which is syntactically determined, cohesive repetition where the use of a pronoun refers back to an NP unless it carries additional information or a variety of functions, repetition of discourse markers such as "you know," and conjuctions such as "but" unless they are in syntactically identical sentences or clauses. In that case they are counted as a part of syntactic repetitions.

[2]In the example (1)*'I think I was on holiday'* (2) *'I think I'd just begun holiday'* the syntactic units "I think I" are syntactically parallel. Therefore, they were counted as syntactic parallelisms. Moreover, as "holiday" was repeated, it was counted as an exact lexical repetition. And finally, line (2) brings additional information to line (1), therefore, it falls into "expansion with addition" category. In this example, there are three repetition overlaps, which are counted and explained according to their categories and functions. In other words, cases like this are treated as individual repetition categories. Whenever lexical, syntactic and discoursal repetitions overlap, the overlaps are examined one by one and counted as lexical, syntactic and discoursal at once.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Repetition as a device to create immediacy: Repetition is used to emphasize the moment of the action/event as of ultimate importance. Repetition of specific details, time frame, location, and people contributes to the emphatic function since specificity creates immediacy. Moreover, the use of time adverbials, direct speech, present/past continuous tenses, while clauses, close deictic adverbs (here/this), clauses of perception process, such as "see, hear, listen" and clauses of affection process, such as "think, consider, wonder, notice," and "just" as time adjunct contributes to the sense of immediacy.

Thematic Repetition

Different forms of repetition contribute to the theme of the story. In other words, repetitious words, word combinations and syntactic structures cohere into a total meaningful and significant pattern and thus produce the overall meaning in the story. There are two types of thematic repetition:

Repetition as a device to suspend action: Narrators use repetition to suspend action, to delay the resolution so that the climax of the story could come in full power. Some narrators use two types of suspension in their stories: initial suspension and immediate suspension. Since they answered the question "Have you ever had a danger of death experience? If not tell me about a situation when you felt very nervous," they start building suspense from the first moment on until the climax is reached. They may provide too much, unnecessary background information to achieve this effect. For instance, to create initial suspension, the narrator may provide unnecessary information through rewording and syntactic parallelism:

> *I must have been ... about 22 or 23 years old,*
> *I'm guessing, yeah,*
> *I'm not exactly sure,*
> *actually I could figure it out because there is an incident...*

Immediate suspension comes into operation just before the narrator reaches the

climax. Repetition of specific details that are related to the climax adds to immediate suspension:

> *...I was driving down the road, and they were just building these new express ways, uhm so I wasn't familiar, with the way they had it set up, I wasn't looking at the lines, they are on the road to tell you to stay on this side of the road or what? So I'm driving down the road, and I see a car in front of me, but he's on the side, he's on the .. next lane over, he's he's waving his arms frantically and he's pointing .. you know, he's pointing, he's pointing (shouts) at something and I'm thinking while I'm driving, "wh what is that guy pointing at?" And I'm still in my lane, and he's still in that lane and he's just going he's going nuts, he's going like this, pointing his finger you know motioning to the right, and so just intuitively, instinctively or whatever, I got over into the next lane. And as soon as I did, there was a car that would have hit me head on...*

Various forms of repetition are used to create tension in a narrative. To achieve this effect narrators may provide details that do not contribute to the overall meaning of the story and repeat them. In addition, narrators create suspense through putting emphasis on the tension in the atmosphere. To achieve this, they used repeated words and phrases that are directly or indirectly related to tension or that denote the psychological moods of the people in the story. Repetition of very specific details or use of immediacy contributes to tension and therefore suspension. Suspension comes to an end when the climactic moment is reached.

Cohesive repetition: Cohesive repetition in the text links referents together through repetition of words that mean nearly the same or exactly the same and thus builds the previously mentioned referents around a major theme. Halliday and Hasan (1976) define "cohesion" as "relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that define it as a text" (p. 4). According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), "the potential for cohesion lies in the systematic resources of reference, ellipsis and so on that are built into the language itself" (p.5). They state that structure in a stretch of discourse cchere parts of a sentence together to display the texture of the organic unity. In other words, relations that are cohesive in a sentence refer to the same entity in the sentence by means

of pronominalization rules: the second mention of an entity should be in the pronoun form. Relations that are cohesive in a text display a semantic relation which helps interpret the existence of repetitive linguistic entities or idea units.

In some cases in this study, repetitions of certain lexical or syntactic items may not be cohesively related to each other because the use of the same unit refers to different referents:

> *I'm gonna talk about what's been happening with my* **car** *since January. This is a* **car** *that's just one year old...the* **car** *in front of me slowed down just a little bit*

The first repetition of the lexical unit "my car" is cohesively related to the narrator's car. However, the second repetition of the lexical unit refers to somebody else's car; therefore, it is not cohesively linked with the narrator's car.

Artistic Repetition

Syntactic repetition, lexical repetition or paraphrase can be used to create an artistic effect. Syntactic parallelism provides the flow of the story, creating an artistic effect. According to Tannen (1985) the rhythm that is created through syntactic parallelism "is basic to conversational involvement in the most mechanical sense. It contributes in conversation, as it does in music, poetry, and oratory, to the impact of the discourse on the audience" (p. 139). In other words, rhythm moves the listener emotionally and at the same time "convinces" them. Therefore, syntactic parallelism serves artistic and persuasive purposes. In this study the use of syntactic parallelism, and exact repetition of words which are used in close juxtaposition are taken as the artistic use of the lexical or syntactic unit.

Moreover, according to Shepherd (1990), exact repetition of words of emotions and perceptions that denote anger, fear, sarcasm, happiness, pleasure, and displeasure create "cohesion" which is "poetic" for Tannen: "... all

discourse is poetic, operating on systems of coherence in which form and meaning intertwine. Repetition is one of an array of dynamics by which conversation, like literary discourse, achieves this aesthetic effect" (1990, p. 30). In this study, the function of exact repetition of words of emotions and perceptions is taken as persuasive and artistic at the same time.

Persuasive Repetition

According to Johnstone Koch (1986), reverse paraphrase is used to provide different perspectives. Thus the speaker shows different aspects of an emotion or an action/event to persuade the listener that what s/he is narrating is the point of the story and is worth narrating. Moreover, syntactic parallelism serves this purpose, too. And in addition, repetition of descriptive details tends to be persuasive. Repetitive use of words of emotions and perceptions, employment of repetitive contrasts, words that denote tension directly or indirectly, and repetition of words or phrases that underline the repeated nature of actions/events are taken as persuasive. And finally, the use of subordinate clauses, comparative clauses, unreal conditional clauses and, clauses of reason and cause and past conditional clauses contribute to the persuasive effect.

RESULTS and DISCUSSION

Repetition Types

The analysis of the results that belong to each culture shown in Table 1 reveals that there is no significant difference between the American and the British narrators' use of lexical, syntactic and discoursal repetition. However, as was hypothesized, the Turkish narrators' use of discoursal repetition is significantly greater, while the British and the American narrators' use of syntactic repetition is significantly higher (see Table 1, p. 16).

When these findings are compared to Hofstede's (1980) uncertainty avoidance dimension, Hall's (1976) low- and high-context schema and Levine's (1985) discussion of the use of directness/indirectness, repetition of syntactic

Table 1
Z Value Distribution for Repetition Types

Repetition Type	A/B	B/T	A/T
Lexical Repetition	1.31	-8.66*	-8.31*
Syntactic Repetition	-1.27	12.69*	13.38*
Discoursal Repetition	0.55	-5.00	-4.99

Note. A/B= American vs British B/T= British vs Turkish A/T= American vs Turkish
* *indicates significance at the p >.05 level*

structures, especially exact syntactic repetition, may be taken as an indication of direct communication. Being members of two low-context cultures, the American and the British narrators expressed themselves mostly by repeating syntactic units exactly. Since low-context communication provides information as an explicit code, the findings indicate that by using (exact) syntactic repetitions, the American and the British narrators emphasized and drew attention to the point of the story directly. On the contrary, as members of a high-context culture, the Turkish narrators used discoursal repetition through which they indirectly emphasized the point of the story, conveying the message that the thematically repeated sections of the stories were the important points in their stories. In other words, two low-context cultures' using syntactic repetition and a high-context culture's use of discoursal repetition may be related to cultural variability in the use of directness/indirectness and the dimensions of individuality/collectivity.

Moreover, the use of syntactic/discoursal repetition may be related to Hofstede's low/high uncertainty avoidance dimensions. As members of a high uncertainty avoidance culture, the Turkish narrators used discoursal repetition as a strategy to avoid ambiguity since by repeating certain idea units in different words and phrases, the narrators emphasize the point of the story over and over again. In other words, using discoursal repetition helps avoid ambiguity in relation to the important messages conveyed in the story because the narrator uses a variety of different structures to persuade the listener that the point of his/her story is worth narrating. On the other hand, as members of low uncertainty avoidance cultures such as USA and Britain, the narrators preferred not to use discoursal repetition so much as the members of the high uncertainty avoidance culture in this study, indicating that they did not employ a variety of ambiguity avoidance strategies so much as the Turkish narrators did since low-context communication provides information necessary for the verbal exchange as

an explicit code.

Functions Created by Repetition Types

All the cultures used lexical, syntactic and discoursal repetitions to create expansion (61%-77%) and cohesion (89%-100%) in this study, indicating the universality[3] of these two functions (see Table 2, p. 19). In the American narrative discourse, suspension and persuasion functions are characteristic of the lexical, syntactic and discoursal repetition (see Tables 3 and 4, pp. 20-21. At this point it should be noted that there is no significant difference between the American and the British use of discoursal repetition to create persuasion). In other words, the American narrators used the three types of repetition to build tension by delaying resolution as a cultural characteristic. They built tension by narrating what happened step by step, providing almost every minute detail and by focusing on temporal accuracy (immediacy function, see Table 3) as Tannen has observed (1983). They preferred to use syntactic repetition to achieve their goals. They used explicit persuasive strategies such as using words of emotions and implicit persuasive strategies such as using comparative clauses and unreal conditional clauses to direct the attention to the point of the story, emphasizing that their story was worth narrating. The American narrators' use of the suspension function is significantly higher than those created in the British and the Turkish discourse, emphasizing the narrators' concern with telling an interesting, suspenseful and high-tension story (see Tables 3 and 4). The use of persuasive devices underline their concern with telling credible and interesting stories.

---

[3] The use of a repetition category to create a particular function 58% or more (the average percentage is 53 and the error range is 5%) and the fact that z values for all the cultures are within the range of +1.96 and -1.96 determine that the particular function is a shared, interculturally used feature. If a repetition category is characteristic of a particular culture, it indicates that the culture in question used that category pervasively (more than 58%) and that the z value estimated for the category is significantly higher than the rest.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2
Distribution of Functions in Percentages

Repetition Types	Emphatic Function		Thematic Function			Artistic Function	Persuasive Function
	Cl	Ex	Im	Sus	Coh		
AMERICAN LEXICAL							
TOTAL:439/1146 (38%)	141 (32%)	323 (74%)	183 (42%)	277 (63%)	407 (93%)	167 (38%)	256 (58%)
BRITISH LEXICAL							
TOTAL:255/ 720 (35%)	88 (35%)	192 (75%)	63 (25%)	53 (21%)	226 (89%)	91 (36%)	120 (47%)
TURKISH LEXICAL							
TOTAL:805/1502 (54%)	327 (41%)	617 (77%)	292 (36%)	289 (36%)	751 (93%)	328 (41%)	255 (32%)
AMERICAN SYNTACTIC							
TOTAL: 500/1146 (44%)	160 (32%)	373 (75%)	230 (46%)	297 (59%)	472 (94%)	258 (52%)	327 (65%)
BRITISH SYNTACTIC							
TOTAL:341/ 720 (47%)	121 (36%)	252 (74%)	97 (28%)	108 (32%)	316 (93%)	194 (57%)	136 (40%)
TURKISH SYNTACTIC							
TOTAL:304/1502 (20%)	136 (45%)	232 (76%)	120 (40%)	145 (48%)	295 (97%)	225 (74%)	127 (42%)
AMERICAN DISCOURSAL							
TOTAL:207/1146 (18%)	96 (46%)	142 (69%)	85 (41%)	123 (59%)	207 (100%)	54 (26%)	138 (67%)
BRITISH DISCOURSAL							
TOTAL:124/ 720 (17%)	78 (63%)	75 (61%)	22 (18%)	44 (36%)	123 (99%)	36 (29%)	75 (61%)
TURKISH DISCOURSAL							
TOTAL:393/1502 (26%)	275 (70%)	251 (64%)	119 (30%)	166 (42%)	392 (100%)	95 (24%)	207 (53%)

Note. cl:clarification ex:expansion im:immediacy sus:suspension coh:cohesion

Table 3
Z Value in General Functions

Functions	Emphatic			Thematic		Artistic	Persuasive
	Cl	Ex	Im	Sus	Coh		
Repetition Types							
LEXICAL							
A/B	-0.81	-0.29	4.73*	12.22*	1.73	0.53	2.81*
B/T	-1.74	-0.65	-3.44*	-4.90*	-1.86	-1.44	4.25*
A/T	-3.19*	-1.17	2.07*	9.45*	0.00	-1.04	9.05*
SYNTACTIC							
A/B	-1.20	0.33	5.46*	8.06*	0.57	-1.43	7.34*
B/T	-2.33*	-0.59	-3.23*	-4.19*	-2.36*	-4.62*	-0.52
A/T	-3.68*	-0.32	1.67	3.05*	-2.08*	-6.54*	6.49*
DISCOURSAL							
A/B	-3.06*	1.47	4.74*	4.18*	1.12	-0.59	1.10
B/T	-1.43	-0.60	-2.89*	-1.21	-1.12	1.09	1.58
A/T	-5.76*	-1.24	2.67*	4.02*	0.00	0.54	3.39*

Note. A/B= American vs British B/T= British vs Turkish A/T= American vs Turkish
cl:clarification ex:expansion im:immediacy sus:suspension coh:cohesion
** indicates significance at the p >.05 level*

Table 4
Comparison of Characteristic Functions Created by the Types of Repetition in General

Cultures	Lexical Repetition	Syntactic Repetition	Discoursal Repetition
American	per, sus	per, sus	per, sus
British	-	-	cl, per
Turkish	-	ar	cl

The British lexical and syntactic repetitions do not have characteristic features (except for expansion and cohesion, which are universal traits). However, clarification and persuasive purposes are characteristic of the British discoursal repetition (see Table 4). In other words, the British narrators repeated previous utterances with different structures for clarification purposes to emphasize the point of the story and these functions contributed to the persuasive effect of their stories in general. They sometimes created tension by using syntactic repetition, clarified their previous utterances by using discoursal repetition, provided different perspectives and emphasized their psychological moods and the moods of the people involved in the stories with them. They tended to use linguistic structures that implicitly denoted the mental states of people (persuasive function). The use of explicit persuasive devices underlines their concern with telling credible and interesting stories.

The Turkish lexical repetition does not have a characteristic feature. The syntactic repetition in the Turkish discourse employed artistic functions as the characteristic feature. The rhythmical use of words and clauses to create an artistic effect to move the listeners emotionally contributed to the persuasive effect in general. And finally, their use of discoursal repetition employed clarification functions (Table 4). In other words, the Turkish narrators repeated previous utterances with different structures for clarification purposes and employed strategies to create an artistic effect to emphasize the point of the story and these functions contributed to the overall persuasive effect of their stories in general. Instead of aiming to build tension to reach the peak in a story, they mainly focused on how people felt about their experiences. To achieve this, they used discoursal repetition and thus provided shifts in focus. They generally used words of emotions and structures that explicitly or implicitly denoted psychological states of people.

Table 4 shows the characteristic functions created by the three repetition

types. (Since expansion and cohesive functions are universal and exist in all the cultural discourses, they are excluded in Table 4).

If we take expansion, immediacy and clarification functions as devices of uncertainty avoidance, and suspension, persuasion, cohesion and artistic functions as devices that are used to tell interesting, closely-knit, effective, credible and vivid stories, we see that all the cultures' use of repetition creates expansion almost equally (see Table 3) as a device to avoid uncertainty, and cohesion as a device to narrate closely-knit stories (at this point it should be noted that the Turkish narrators used syntactic repetition for cohesion more than the others). To avoid ambiguity, the narrators used repetitions to create certain functions. These functions are divided into two subcategories: high-context communication is considered to employ the clarification function as a characteristic feature found in high-context communication to avoid ambiguity and low-context communication is considered to employ expansion and immediacy as characteristic features. In other words, by employing expansion and immediacy, the narrators provided information, emphasizing the point of the story explicitly and by using clarification, they indirectly drew attention to the point of their stories. The results reveal that all the narrators used expansion as an ambiguity avoidance device to provide explicit information almost equally. According to the Hall-Hofstede ambiguity avoidance scale adapted by Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988) (see Appendix A) the Turkish narrators are supposed to use uncertainty avoidance devices more than the other narrators while the American and the British uses of ambiguity avoidance should be lower than the Turkish use. The results indicate that the Turkish narrators used discoursal repetition as a characteristic feature of high-context communication for clarification purposes, which is a characteristic high-context trait, in addition to expansion, suggesting a higher ambiguity avoidance tendency (see Tables 3 and 4). When the American discourse is considered, it is observed that the American narrators used

expansion only as the characteristic uncertainty avoidance device, which is considered a low-context communication feature. Although the immediacy function is not a distinguishing function in the American discourse (42%, 46%, 41% in lexical, syntactic and discoursal repetitions, respectively, see Table 2), the American narrators used the three repetition types to create this function more than the British and the Turkish narrators as an uncertainty avoidance device. They did not use the clarification function as a characteristic feature, which is considered a high-context communication feature.

The British narrators' use of discoursal repetition correlates positively with the Hall-Hofstede scores since the British use of discoursal repetition is significantly lower than the Turkish use. However, the fact that the British narrators used the clarification function more than the American narrators and that their use was closer to the Turkish use indicate a similarity between the Turkish and the British discoursal repetition in terms of functions that serve a distinguishing purpose between the high- and low-context communication.

When the z value distribution of functions is investigated closely, it is observed that the narrators preferred to use certain functions to others more, indicating different cultural expectations (e.g. to narrate vivid, credible and suspenseful stories, the American narrators created suspension, immediacy and persuasion). Table 3 shows that a particular cultural group of narrators employed a function more by using a certain type of repetition more than the other narrators (e.g. The American narrators used lexical and discoursal repetitions to create the immediacy function more than the others).

Table 5[4] (p. 25) summarizes the three cultures' preferences for certain functions to avoid uncertainty and to narrate interesting, appealing and vivid stories.

---

[4]*The results displayed in Table 5 are based on the percentage distribution presented in Table 2.*

Table 5
Distribution of Functions to Cultures as Uncertainty Avoidance Devices and as Devices to Narrate Vivid Stories

Repetition Types	Functions as Uncertainty Avoidance Devices	Functions as Devices to Narrate Vivid Stories
LEXICAL		
American	expansion	suspension, cohesion, persuasion
British	expansion	cohesion
Turkish	expansion	cohesion
SYNTACTIC		
American	expansion	suspension, cohesion, persuasion
British	expansion	cohesion
Turkish	expansion	cohesion, artistic
DISCOURSAL		
American	expansion	suspension, cohesion, persuasion
British	clarification. expansion	cohesion, persuasion
Turkish	clarification, expansion	cohesion

As Table 5 indicates, there are two culturally shared functions. First, the expansion function was created by all the repetition types universally as an uncertainty avoidance device which is considered a characteristic feature of low-context communication. However, the Turkish and the British discoursal repetition depart from the American discourse. At this point it should be noted that the wide use of a high-context communication feature by the narrators of a low-context culture suggests the interrelationship between cultural discourses. It should also be noted once again that use of discoursal repetition in narratives is considered a part of high-context communication and the clarification function created by this type of repetition underlines the tendency to use high-context communication features in the narratives. The Turkish and the British discoursal repetitions display a similarity at this point.

Second, the cohesive function as a device to narrate closely-knit stories was created by all the repetition types in all the cultures. However, the American lexical, syntactic and discoursal repetition employed other functions (suspension, persuasion) in addition to cohesion more than the other narrators to narrate interesting and vivid stories. In the British and Turkish discourse, suspension did not play a distinguishing role. In other words, the American discourse appears to employ a variety of functions.

When the general use of functions is considered, it is observed that the British narrators' use of repetition to create various functions is in between. However, when we look at the characteristic functions with high z values, we see that their use of functions, particularly clarification, is closer to the Turkish use of characteristic functions. In other terms, more often than not the British use of functions displayed similarities with the Turkish discourse.

Repetition Categories

During the analysis of the stories, it was noticed that there are three repetition categories that are common to the three cultures: exact lexical repetition, syntactic parallelism and paraphrase (Table 6, p. 28).

All the narrators from the three cultures used these repetition categories very often. However, exact syntactic repetition as a fourth repetition category is pervasive among the American and the British narrators while it is not a distinguishing feature of the Turkish narrative discourse (5% on the overall scale). The Turkish narrators used exact lexical repetition more than the others while the American and the British narrators used exact syntactic repetition on a significantly higher scale, indicating that the members of low-context cultures used more syntactic repetition. There is no significant difference in the use of paraphrase among cultures. However, the Turkish narrators used expansion with different structures and explanation with different structures[5] more in addition to paraphrase.

The close examination of the functions supports the potential cross-cultural communication defects that may arise due to the discoursal expectations of different cultures. For instance, American narrators would expect to hear exact syntactic repetition which should be used to create tension, to carry the listener to the moment of the action/event/experience, and to employ explicit/implicit persuasive strategies. When they hear syntactic repetition for clarification purposes only, they may miss the point of the story and a communication defect will occur.

The close examination of the use of repetition in oral discourse to achieve certain goals reveals that the American narrative discourse reflects

---

5 z values for expansion with different structures:
A/B: -0.42 B/T: -2.08 A/T: -2.80
z values for explanation with different structures:
A/B: 0.74 B/T: -3.87 A/T: -3.26

Table 6
Z distribution for Salient Repetition Categories

	AMERICAN/BRITISH	BRITISH/TURKISH	AMERICAN/TURKISH
1. Exact lexical repetition	0.45	-7.39*	-7.92*
2. Exact syntactic repetition	-2.22*	8.94*	8.37*
3. Syntactic parallelism	0	6.55*	7.76*
4. Paraphrase	0	-1.43	-1.64

* *indicates significance at the >.05 level*

characteristics of direct low-context communication where the use of ambiguity avoidance strategies is limited to the employment of expansion and immediacy functions in repetitions, both of which are considered low-context ambiguity avoidance strategies. The Turkish discoursal repetition reflects characteristics of both low- and high-context features (expansion/ clarification) although Turkey is a collectivistic, high-context culture. In addition, the fact that the Turkish narrators used the three types of repetition for immediacy purposes more than the British narrators, who belong to a low-context, individualistic culture, implies the interrelationship between cultural discourses. This is further supported by the British narrators' use of discoursal repetition for clarification purposes, which is a characteristic feature of high-context communication. In other words, there is an exchange of discourse structures between the individualistic/low-context cultures and the collectivistic, high-context cultures (British-Turkish in this case) although there are culture-specific uses of language (functions of repetition in this study) which may affect the members of different cultures differently, and which may result in different reactions/responses.

To put it differently, narrators from different cultural orientations use different discourse strategies to evaluate their narratives and to involve listeners in their stories. However, since cultural expectations direct communication, the listeners may get bored or they may miss the point of the stories which reveals why the narrator is telling that particular story. This indicates potential problems in cross-cultural communication. For instance, if the narrator is not familiar with the American discourse structure, and if his own discourse rules require the use of discoursal repetition for the clarification function through which he will repeat his previous utterances without adding any new information, the American listener is very likely to miss the point of the story. In other words, if a foreign speaker does not use the correct strategies for the target discourse, he will not be able to communicate

his point in narrating the story. Similarly, the interlocutors during a conversational exchange will miss the point of the stories if their expectation is to hear discoursal repetitions for clarification purposes. The use of repetition for clarification purposes not only aims to clarify the previous utterances but also buys time. In other words, this type of function enables the speaker to organize what s/he will say next and helps the listener to process what s/he has just heard.

DISCUSSION

Assessment

The generalizations reached in this study cannot extend beyond the limits of this research mainly because of the limited number of the subjects. Therefore, conclusions drawn in this study cannot be regarded as cultural generalizations.

Implications

Theoretical Implications

In the stories analyzed for this study, it was seen that different repetition types and different types of discourse strategies were employed by the narrators from different cultures, indicating a potential communication defect. Expectation of a particular repetition type and functions those repetition types serve may disappoint the listener and may cause him/her to miss the point of the story. Listeners from one particular culture (e.g. low-context, individualistic cultures) may grow bored with the story teller from a different cultural group (e.g. high-context, collectivistic cultures). Thus, they may think the involvement strategies do not provide adequate evaluation to justify continuing to their listening to the story. If a listener does not understand the narrator's discourse goals, then cross-cultural communication defects may probably occur. S/he may not understand how the structure of the individual narrative discourse fits within the overall conversational/ narrative discourse. Studies focusing on the listeners' evaluation/ comprehension of different discourse strategies are

believed to be meaningful in terms of cross-cultural communication.

Working on external/internal evaluation strategies in a cross-cultural setting is believed to be beneficial since such a research would specify what the definition of a good and effective story-telling is according to different cultural assumptions. Such a study may throw light on what kind of evaluation strategies create effectiveness more in a narrative in a cross-cultural setting.

Furthermore, this research reveals a similarity between the British and the American discourse in terms of the use of repetition types and another similarity between the Turkish and the British discourse but this time in terms of the employment of functions. This may suggest that there are traits of the Turkish discoursal strategies to create emotional involvement in the British narrative discourse. Since the Turkish language and culture were widely influenced by the Arabic and the French languages and cultures in the past, a comparative study of Arabic and Turkish, Turkish and French, British English and French discourse structures would throw light on the resemblances that exist between the above-mentioned languages and also between the discourse goals of these cultures.

Pedagogical Implications

Based on the results drawn from the research, focusing on the discourse structure of a foreign language either as a language learner or a teacher/researcher is advisable. Recent studies have emphasized the importance of teaching English in a meaningful context (Berns, 1990). In addition to bringing language functions and teaching situational English into focus, researchers such as Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988) emphasize the importance of learning the cultural features, communication styles and goals of the culture of the target language: "Communication and culture reciprocally influence each other. The culture from which individuals come affects the way they communicate, and the way individuals communicate can change the culture they share." Smith (1987) argues that if the discourse strategies of the mother tongue is used in

intercultural communication, there will definitely be misreadings on the part of the listeners. Lezberg and Hilferty (1978) state that native speakers have a tendency to "forgive and help correct lexical or grammatical errors" (p. 49). According to Lezberg and Hilferty, native speakers "react almost unconsciously" when they hear nonnative speakers' register errors or errors that are related to role relationships or those that result from lack of knowledge on cultural and sociolinguistic training which provides information on what kind of language should be used in which linguistic environment, such as home or business environment, they never correct these errors. In other words, if the students learning a foreign language are exposed to the discourse structure of the target culture, their participation in the learning process and their comprehension will increase. Similarly, the discourse and involvement strategies of the oral narratives will provide the students of the foreign language with enough sociolinguistic and cultural knowledge and experience that they will use in the literature and translation classroom as well as in oral cross-cultural communication.

REFERENCES

Berns, M. (1990). Why language teaching needs the sociolinguist? *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 46,* 339-353.

Gudykunst, W.B., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). *Culture and interpersonal communication.* Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Hall, E.T. (1976). *Beyond culture.* New York: Doubleday.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976). **Cohesion in English.** London: Longman.

Hofstede, G. (1979). Value systems in forty countries. In L. Eckensberger, W. Lonner, & Y. Poortinga (Eds.), *Cross-cultural contributions to psychology.* Lisse, The Netherlends: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Hofstede G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values.* London: Sage Publications

Johnstone Koch, B. (1986). Repeating yourself: Discourse paraphrase and the generation of language. *Proceedings of the First Eastern States Conference on Linguistics,* 250-259.

Labov, W. (1972). The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. In W. Labov (Ed.), *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English vernacular.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Levine, D. (1985). *The flight from ambiguity.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lezberg, A. & Hilferty, A. (1978). Discourse analysis in the reading class. **TESOL Quarterly, 12 (1),** 47-55.

Mendenhall, W., Reinmuth, J. E. & Beaver, R. (1989). *Statistics for management and economics.* Boston: Pws. Kent Publishing Company.

Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Persson, G. (1974). *Repetition in English.* Uppsala.

Shepherd, S. C. (1990) Functions of repetition: Variation in narrative and conversational discourse. In J. A. Edmondson, C. Feagin, & P. Mülhausler (Eds.), *Development and diversity: Linguistic variation across time and space.* A publication of The Summer Institute of Linguistics and The University of Texas at Arlington.

Smith, L.E. (1987). Introduction: Discourse strategies and cross-cultural communication. In L.E. Smith (Ed.), *Discourse across cultures: Strategies in world Englishes.* London: Prentice Hall

Tannen, D. (1983). "I take out the rock - Dok!": How Greek women tell about being molested (and create involvement). *Anthropological Linguistics, 25,* 1, 359-374.

Tannen, D. (1985). Relative focus on involvement in oral and written discourse. In D. R. Olson, N. Torrance & A. Hildyard (Eds.), *Literacy, language and learning*. New York: CUP.

Tannen, D. (1990). Ordinary conversation and literary discourse: Coherence and the poetics of repetition. In E. H. Bendix (Ed.), *The Uses of linguistics*. New York: The New York Academy of sciences.

Tannen, D. (1991). **Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse.** New York: Cambridge University Press.

Triandis, H. (1986). Collectivism vs. individualism: A reconceptualisation of a basic concept in cross-cultural psychology. In C. Bagley & G. Verma (Eds.), *Cross-cultural perspectives of childhood and adolescence*. London: Macmillan.

APPENDIX A

Scores on Hall's and Hofstede's Dimensions of Cultural Variability for Selected Countries

Country	Power Distance	Uncertainty Avoidance	Individualism	Masculinity	Context
Arab Cultures	80	68	38	53	high
Australia	36	51	90	61	low
Austria	11	70	55	79	low
Canada	39	48	80	52	low
Denmark	18	23	74	16	low
Finland	33	59	63	26	low
France	68	86	71	43	low
Germany	35	65	67	66	low
Great Britain	35	35	89	66	low
Greece	60	112	35	57	high
Iran	58	59	41	43	high
Italy	50	75	76	70	low
Japan	54	92	46	95	high
Norway	31	50	69	8	low
Spain	57	86	51	42	high
Sweden	31	29	71	5	low
Turkey	66	85	37	45	high
USA	40	46	91	62	low

* Adapted from Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey, 1988.

APPENDIX B

Transcription Conventions*

The following transcription conventions are used.

. indicates sentence final falling intonation
, indicates clause-final intonation
! indicates exclamation
... three dots indicate pause of ½ second or more
.. two dots indicate perceptible pause of ½ second
CAPS indicate emphatic stress
[Brackets show overlap
/words/ in slashes show uncertain transcription
/?/ indicates inaudible utterance
vowel-vowel elongated vowel

* Adapted from Tannen, 1991.